

AUTO CR - LOG SUMMARY #1051201

TYPE: INFO

Incident Finding / Overall Case Finding

Description of Incident	Finding	Entered By	Entered Date
	(None Entered)		

Reporting Party Information

	Role	Name	Star No.	Emp No.	UOA / UOD	Position	Sex	Race	Address	Phone
NON-CPD	Reporting Party Third Party						F	U		

Incident Information

Incident From Date/Time	Address of Incident	Beat	Dist. Of Occurrence	Location Code	Location Description
17-JUN-2011 12:00 - 17-JUN-2011 12:00		0823	008	277 - PARKING LOT/GARAGE(NON-RESID.)	

Accused Members

	Role	Name	Star No.	Emp No.	UOA / UOD	Position	Status	Initial / Intake Allegation
CPD Employee	Accused	UNKNOWN,					ON Duty	The complainant who did not witness the incident alleges that the accused officers searched and detained her daughter and her friend without justification. The complainant alleges that her vehicle was impounded without justification. The complainant alleges during the appeals hearing to recover the cost of her impoundment fees, one of the accused officers account of the incident "made no sense and was 100% lying." The complainant alleges that the accused officers failed to inventory or return a pair \$150.00 sunglasses.

Other Involved Parties

	Role	Name	Star No.	Emp No.	UOA / UOD	Position	Sex	Race	Address	Phone
NON-CPD	Victim/Subject						F	U		
NON-CPD	Witness						M	U	CHICAGO	

Involved Party Associations

Role	Rep. Party Name	Related Person	Relationship
------	-----------------	----------------	--------------

Incident Details

CR Required?		Manner Incident Received?	LETTER
Confidential?		Biased Language?	N
Extraordinary Occurrence?	N	Bias Based Profiling?	N
Police Shooting (U)?	N	Alcohol Related?	N
Non Disciplinary Intervention:	N	Pursuit Related?	N
Initial Assignment:	IAD	Violence in Workplace?	N
Notify IAD Immediately?	N	Domestic Violence?	N
EEO Complaint No.:			
Civil Suit No.:		Civil Suit Settled Date:	
Notify Chief Administrator?	N	Notify Chief?	
Notify Coordinator?		Notification Does Not Apply?	Y
Notification Other?	N		
Notification Comments:			

Incident Category List

Incident Category	Primary?	Initial?
03B - GROUP 03 - IMPROPER SEARCH IMPROPER SEARCH OF PERSON	Y	Y

Investigator History

Investigator	Type	Assigned Team	Assigned Date	Scheduled End Date	Investigation End Date	No. of Days
PLANEY, JEFFERY	Primary	DISTRICT/UNIT	25-JAN-2012	24-FEB-2012		2730

Extension History

Name	Previous Scheduled End Date	Extended Scheduled End Date	Date Certified Letter Sent	Reason Selected	Explanation	Extension Report Date	Approved By	Approved Date	Approval Comments
------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------	-------------	-----------------------	-------------	---------------	-------------------

Current Allegations

Accused Name	Seq. No.	Allegation	Category	Subcategory	Finding
--------------	----------	------------	----------	-------------	---------

Situations (Allegation Details)

Accused Name	Alleg. No.	Situation	Victim/Offender Armed?	Weapon Types	Weapon Other	Weapon Recovered?	Deceased?
--------------	------------	-----------	------------------------	--------------	--------------	-------------------	-----------

Status History

Resulting Status	Status Date/Time	Created By	Position	UOA / UOD	Comments
CLOSED/FINAL	23-OCT-2018 05:23	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE	121 /	closed in CRIMS March 2011
PENDING INVESTIGATION	25-JAN-2012 10:25	KELLY, BERNETTE	SR DATA ENTRY OPR	121 /	
PENDING ASSIGN INVESTIGATOR	13-JAN-2012 11:42	DUNN, BRENDA	SERGEANT OF POLICE	121 /	
PENDING APPROVE TEAM	12-JAN-2012 08:37	DEL RIVERO, MINERVA	POLICE OFFICER	121 /	
PENDING ASSIGN TEAM	11-JAN-2012 10:52	DEAN, BRUCE	SUPERVISING INV COPA	113 /	
PENDING SUPERVISOR REVIEW	11-JAN-2012 10:41	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		
PRELIMINARY	11-JAN-2012 10:38	DEAN, BRUCE	SUPERVISING INV COPA	113 /	
PENDING SUPERVISOR REVIEW	11-JAN-2012 10:21	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		
PRELIMINARY	11-JAN-2012 10:12	DEAN, BRUCE	SUPERVISING INV COPA	113 /	
PENDING SUPERVISOR REVIEW	11-JAN-2012 10:10	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		
PRELIMINARY	11-JAN-2012 08:28	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		

Attachments

No.	Type	Related Person	No. of Pages	Narrative	Original in File	Entered By	Entered Date/Time	Status	Approve Content	Approve Inclusion
1	FACE SHEET					DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	11-JAN-2012 08:28			
	DOCUMENTS - INTAKE INCIDENT		8	Letter From Complainant	N	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	11-JAN-2012 10:07	APPROVED		
	DOCUMENTS - INTAKE INCIDENT		5		N	DEL RIVERO, MINERVA	12-JAN-2012 08:37	APPROVED		
	DOCUMENTS - INTAKE INCIDENT		1	Envelope From the Complainant	N	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	11-JAN-2012 10:10	APPROVED		

Review Incident

Review Type	Accused/Involved Member Name	Result Type	Reviewed By	Position	Unit	Review Date	Remarks
-------------	------------------------------	-------------	-------------	----------	------	-------------	---------

Review Incident

Review Accused

Review Type	Accused/Involved Member Name	Result Type	Reviewed By	Position	Unit	Review Date	Remarks
-------------	------------------------------	-------------	-------------	----------	------	-------------	---------

Accused Finding History

Accused	Allegation	Reviewed By	Reviewed Date/Time	CCR?	Concur?	Finding	Finding Comments
---------	------------	-------------	--------------------	------	---------	---------	------------------

Accused Penalty History

Accused	Reviewed By	Reviewed Date/Time	CCR?	Concur?	Penalty	Penalty Comments
---------	-------------	--------------------	------	---------	---------	------------------

Findings

Accused Name	Allegations	Category	Concur?	Findings	Comments
--------------	-------------	----------	---------	----------	----------

FACE SHEET (Notification Date: 11-JAN-2012) - LOG #1051201

TYPE: INFO

Reporting Party Information

	Role	Name	Star No.	Emp No.	UOA / UOD	Position	Sex	Race	Address	Phone
NON-CPD	Reporting Party Third Party						F	U		

Incident Information

Incident From Date/Time	Address of Incident	Beat	Dist. Of Occurrence	Location Code	Location Description
17-JUN-2011 12:00 - 17-JUN-2011 12:00		0823	008	277 - PARKING LOT/GARAGE(NON-RESID.)	

Accused Members

	Role	Name	Star No.	Emp No.	UOA / UOD	Position	Status	Initial / Intake Allegation
CPD Employee	Accused	UNKNOWN,					ON Duty	The complainant who did not witness the incident alleges that the accused officers searched and detained her daughter and her friend without justification. The complainant alleges that her vehicle was impounded without justification. The complainant alleges during the appeals hearing to recover the cost of her impoundment fees, one of the accused officers account of the incident "made no sense and was 100% lying." The complainant alleges that the accused officers failed to inventory or return a pair \$150.00 sunglasses.

Incident Details

CR Required?		Manner Incident Received?	LETTER
Confidential?		Biased Language?	N
Extraordinary Occurrence?	N	Bias Based Profiling?	N
Police Shooting (U)?	N		
Motor Vehicle (V)?		Alcohol Related?	N
Non Disciplinary Intervention:	N	Pursuit Related?	N
Initial Assignment:	IAD	Violence in Workplace?	N
Notify IAD Immediately?	N	Domestic Violence?	N
EEO Complaint No.:			
Civil Suit No.:		Notify Chief?	
Notify Chief Administrator?	N	Notification Does Not Apply?	Y
Notify Coordinator?			
Notification Other?	N		

Initial Incident Category List

Initial Incident Category	Primary?
03B - GROUP 03 - IMPROPER SEARCH IMPROPER SEARCH OF PERSON	Y

Assignment History

Assigned To	Assigned Team	Investigator	Assignment Date/Time	Assigned By	Reason
IAD	DISTRICT/UNIT	PLANEY, JEFFERY (PRIMARY INV)	25-JAN-2012 10:25	KELLY, BERNETTE	
IAD	DISTRICT/UNIT	-	12-JAN-2012 08:37	DEL RIVERO, MINERVA	
IAD	INTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION	-	11-JAN-2012 20:28	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	

Status History

Status History

Resulting Status	Status Date/Time	Created By	Position	UOA / UOD	Comments
CLOSED/FINAL	23-OCT-2018 05:23	COSTELLO, ROBERT	SERGEANT OF POLICE	121 /	closed in CRIMS March 2011
PENDING INVESTIGATION	25-JAN-2012 10:25	KELLY, BERNETTE	SR DATA ENTRY OPR	121 /	
PENDING ASSIGN INVESTIGATOR	13-JAN-2012 11:42	DUNN, BRENDA	SERGEANT OF POLICE	121 /	
PENDING APPROVE TEAM	12-JAN-2012 08:37	DEL RIVERO, MINERVA	POLICE OFFICER	121 /	
PENDING ASSIGN TEAM	11-JAN-2012 10:52	DEAN, BRUCE	SUPERVISING INV COPA	113 /	
PENDING SUPERVISOR REVIEW	11-JAN-2012 10:41	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		
PRELIMINARY	11-JAN-2012 10:38	DEAN, BRUCE	SUPERVISING INV COPA	113 /	
PENDING SUPERVISOR REVIEW	11-JAN-2012 10:21	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		
PRELIMINARY	11-JAN-2012 10:12	DEAN, BRUCE	SUPERVISING INV COPA	113 /	
PENDING SUPERVISOR REVIEW	11-JAN-2012 10:10	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		
PRELIMINARY	11-JAN-2012 08:28	DOUGLAS, KHRYSTL	INTAKE AIDE		

December 20, 2011

Independent Police Review Authority
10 W. 35th Street
Chicago, IL 60616

To Whom It May Concern:

The following letters concern my complaints with regard to the Chicago Police Department from both my daughter and myself. While this incident occurred in June, I waited until the court case at the end of July and then attempted to learn the names of the two female police officers by requesting information. This has taken time, and the fact that I also am currently working close to 80 hours a week has made it difficult for me to accomplish this sooner.

I have included three statements - one is the statement from my daughter which was written the day after the incident and later notarized the end of June, another is my own experience dealing with the Chicago Police, and last, is the court case which ensued.

As you will see by my statements, I am extremely angry, upset and horrified by the behavior of the Chicago Police Department and the Chicago legal department. I have been unable to obtain the names to the two female police officers involved. All I know is that they are from the 8th district. This involved the "arrest" of [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] on June 17, 2011. Docket # [REDACTED] All charges were later dropped against [REDACTED] however, I (an innocent citizen) am out \$1500 which is a life savings considering I am on the verge of losing my house. I would like to be assured that these female police officers are aware of my complaints and the devastating affects their corrupt activity has had on the lives of innocent people. If you need further information, please contact me at [REDACTED] Thank you.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Written by [REDACTED] on June 18, 2011

My daughter called and informed me she was someplace in Chicago without her car - it had been taken by the police. I was shocked. The police literally walked away and left a 17 year old girl who had no way to get home out on the street - in the dark - on the south side of Chicago - and did not even call a parent or take her back to the station.

I insisted she walk into the police building she said was nearby and hand the phone to a police officer or ANYONE. I needed to talk to an adult and find out exactly what was going on. My daughter went in and tried repeatedly to get someone to talk to me - everyone refused. On the other end I could hear her plead - "just talk to my mom for a minute" and I could hear their answer of "no". What is going on here? As tax payers we pay their salary. They are supposed to be there to help and serve the community and they take my car and won't even speak to me? Finally, I was told (by my daughter) that I was to go that night to the impound to get the car and to pick up my daughter - who would be at the impound.

This was obviously not enough information. Could I pay by check? Did I need cash? Do I pay at the impound station? The title of the car was in my husband's name and he died. Did I have to get a new title? (yes - cost \$260) How late was the impound place open? My daughter was given different answers where she was to be picked up.

Finally, after 20 minutes my daughter got a phone number to the car impound and I called. The information the police had given me (through my daughter) was totally incorrect. I could NOT retrieve my car that evening. I had to wait until the next day and go the [REDACTED] and pay there first. The cost was NOT \$1,000 - it was \$1160. How could the police not know this information? They did NOT drive my daughter to the impound as they had said - they drove her to a different police station. Where? I don't know. I went online and retrieved the rest of the information I needed since no one was talking to me.

The police drove my car to the police station and whether they drove it to the impound I don't know. I read online that police are not supposed to be driving cars without the owner's permission. Retrieving my car was beyond ridiculous and took an entire day to accomplish. I did notice on the sheet that it was marked off - Damage to outside of car? - Yes. There is NO damage. Was this put on the sheet in case the police damaged my car and wanted to claim it was damaged before it went to the impound? Shouldn't the police be honest?

I have now told my children they are NOT to go into Chicago. It is scary to live in a community where you have to be afraid of the police and what they will do. Their reputation will ruin Chicago. My daughter's godfather is a former Chicago Police officer. We used to believe the Chicago Police Department should be admired - no longer.

[REDACTED]

Written on June 18, 2011

Dictated by [REDACTED]

On 6/17/11 I found someone on Craigslist who was selling the cell phone I wanted to buy. I did not want to go into Chicago alone to meet a strange person, so I called a friend who agreed to go with me to meet this person at a public place.

My friend and I drove up to the 7-11 where we had agreed to meet. A police car was in the parking lot and I parked next to them. (Why would I park next to the police if I was doing anything wrong?) The police got out and went into the 7-11. Soon after we arrived the person I was buying the phone pulled in the lot and parked on the other side. He approached me in my car and the phone was given to me. I checked the phone and then handed the money over. He walked back to his truck and left. (I still have all the text messages on my old phone making the arrangements to buy the cell phone - to prove this was the reason we were there.)

The police came out of the store and we decided to go in. As the police were walking toward their car I was gathering my purse and putting the new cell phone away. The police pulled out. We had been in our car a total of 5 to 6 minutes. (We waited 2-3 minutes for the seller, spoke to him for a few minutes, and spent 1 minute gathering our stuff. Is it now considered suspicious to sit in a car for 2-3 minutes?)

My friend bought an icee and we left and got in the car. I turned on the GPS and I was typing in the information to go home. I put on my seatbelt and put my car in reverse when I realized the police had pulled in behind my car.

I waited for them to move. They then moved next to my car and rolled down the window and asked why we were there. I told them exactly why we were there - I had just bought a phone off of Craigslist. The police got out of the car and came up to the windows. I explained again and told her that I had both phones and I had the text messages to prove it. She asked for my drivers license. I asked if she wanted my insurance and she said no.

One police officer grabbed my friend's arm and pulled him out. She began patting my friend and he said, "excuse me ma'am, can you tell me why you are searching me?" She responded, "because you look suspicious". He said, "how do I look suspicious?" She said because you have been sitting here for 5 minutes. My friend asked what had happened to his (\$160) sunglasses and she said they were in the car.

The other police officer asked me to step out of the vehicle and opened the door. I asked why? She said "do you have anything on you?" I answered "are you serious?" I was wearing pants with no pockets and a nice shirt with no pockets - I had just come from a job interview. I then said "no". She then began patting me down and searching my bra and breasts and had me take off my shoes. Then she told me to go to the back of my car and put my hands on the back of the car. As I started back, I realized that the other police officer had already started searching the car without asking for consent. She dumped out everything from my backpack

and my purse, she even began taking the mechanical pencils apart and breaking them. She asked if there were any drugs and we both responded with "no". She opened the glove compartment and started throwing things out of the glove compartment.

(Online it states: The police also can "frisk" the occupants for weapons **IF** the officers have a "reasonable suspicion" that the occupants are involved in criminal activity and are concerned for their safety. There was absolutely zero suspicion here of anything.)

The police officer then found the grinder - which had NO drugs in it - in the door. My friend said that it was his. I was not aware that he had it. We were put in handcuffs and told we were under arrest and said our car would be impounded for \$1,000. I then yelled and said "I did not do anything. All I was doing was sitting in a 7-11 parking lot." I was put in the back of the police car. After a few minutes the police officer came to my side of the car and took the handcuffs off me and said, "you are free to go. We realize we cannot arrest you for anything". I said, "ok, am I actually free to go?" She said, "you can go, but we are impounding your car."

The police drove the car to the police station. We went into the police station and my friend went inside and the other police officer took me to the car. The car was parked on the side of the road with all the lights on. I asked "did you leave my lights on?" and the officer responded, "no, your car must be broken". (The car is not broken. The battery could have died if I did not noticed this.) I turned off the lights and the police officer began yelling at me to get my stuff out of the car. She was yelling at me to hurry, however, everything from my purse had been dumped out all over the car. I was trying as fast as I could to get everything.

I was very upset about what had happened to my car and the police officer said "you could have a better attitude about all of this". I said "I'm sorry but I am not going to have a great attitude after some one takes my car and says I need to pay \$1,000 just because I was sitting in a parking lot."

The police officer tried to lock the door and said, "is your car broken with the lock?" I said, "no". She continued to say that the car was broken (was trying to lock the door without closing the door).

The police officer started to walk to the police station. I said, "so what do I do now?" The police officer said, "nothing - you are free to go". I said "what do you mean? I would love to just leave but you took my car." As I was trying to talk to her she was walking away from me, leaving me outside - alone - late at night - in the dark - with no way to get home.

I had no idea where my friend was taken. I had his cell phone because when they pulled him out of the car his cell phone remained in the car. I had no way to contact him and no one told me what was going to happen with him or if he was going home or how he would get there.


I then went into the police department and went up to the desk. I asked where my friend was and if I could go wherever he was hoping that I might be able to get a ride. The police officer

said, "yes, we will give you a ride to where your friend is." She said, "just wait here and I will be right back." I waited for about 25 minutes and she had not come back. I then went back to the desk and asked the woman where the other police officer went. I explained that she said she would give me a ride and the woman at the desk said, "we don't do that. Anyway - she went home." Two other police officers standing there made it clear that they never give out rides. At this point I called my mother again because I had no idea how I would get home and I did not even know where I was.

My mother was finally able to reach my brother and they were then on their way. There was no where to sit so the police told me I should wait outside. The police officer then came back about 45 minutes later and said, "come on, let's go". I said "my mother is already coming here because the woman at the desk said you had gone home." She - very sarcastically said, "yeah, right" as if she didn't believe me. She then said, "well, figure it out quick because we don't have all day." I then asked if my friend's father was still there and she said they would not leave until I got there.

The police officer took me to a car that my friend was sitting in. I called my friend's parents because they did not know themselves where their son was. The police had not told them exactly where he was at. We then went to another police station.

The police told me to go to my friend's parents who had now arrived and were sitting in a car and they took my friend into the building. We waited for another one and a half hours before my friend was released. After we got the car back I searched the whole car and my friend's new \$160 sun glasses were gone.



Maria C. Sanchez
OFFICIAL SEAL
MARIA C. SANCHEZ
Notary Public - State of Illinois
My Commission Expires Feb 09, 2014
7/1/11

July 25, 2011

I requested an appeal. I attended the first hearing which was 3 ½ weeks later and the City of Chicago said they were not ready and it was rescheduled for another 3 weeks later. My daughter and I attended the second hearing. The lawyer for the city began by requesting that I be considered a hostile witness and not be allowed to talk. What?? I had not yet said one word - this was MY car and MY \$1,160 that we were fighting for and he wants to tell me I can't talk?? I was the one who requested the hearing and he tries to deny me the right to talk? The judge said it was denied and I could speak.

I was shown the paperwork for the first time for a brief minute. Why was I never given any paperwork myself? Why was I NOT given a copy??? I didn't even have a chance to read it. Why was I given no information when it was my car and my money??

We were all sworn in and the police officer began with her statement. Yes - we were all sworn to tell the truth and she lied repeatedly. What she said made no sense.

The police officer said they were sitting in a parking lot across the street from the 7/11. (Not true - my daughter parked her car next to them and saw them.) She said they noticed my daughter and her friend in the car and went over to see if they were okay and they were safe. What??? At this time it was light outside and they were two people who had driven into a 7-11 parking lot - why would they not be safe??? . They were only in the car a few minutes before walking into the 7/11. They walked out of the 7/11, got in the car and immediately turned on the car when the police blocked them from leaving - they were certainly not coming over for a safety check.

Then she testified that they got out of the car and approached them because they smelled marijuana? What??? (She claims they smelled marijuana after stating they were in a parking lot across the street - there were no drugs in the car - and the grinder was a small closed container - clearly 100% lying.) My daughter had no idea the grinder was even in the car. The windows were closed. They were sitting on the south side of Chicago - my daughter chose to park next to the police car - is she going to do that if there was marijuana in the car or if she even had knowledge of the grinder in her friend's pocket?? The police approached the car because everyone else in the parking lot was either Hispanic or black - and this is the reason they were targeted. Clearly discrimination.

After this statement by the police officer my daughter asked, "How could you smell marijuana if it has been shown that there was only .3 (or .03) grams that was in a metal container with a lid??? No answer. (There were no drugs in the container.) My daughter and I each asked questions. Why is it that I answered ALL of my questions directly with honest and complete answers, but ALL of the questions that both my daughter and I asked were ignored??? The police officer didn't answer anything - nor did the lawyer.

The judge ruled in favor of the police. No surprise. In the case before ours it was obvious to everyone that the police officer's account made no sense and was 100% lying -

yet the ruling was in favor of the police. I have spoken with two lawyers who both claim to be very familiar with Chicago police courts. Both informed me the appeal decisions are decided before you even walk through the door - the citizen never wins. One lawyer even said to me, "you wouldn't believe the things the police here are doing now to get money - it's pathetic."

What ever happened to justice?? Why is there no justice in Chicago?? I have read that in other states cars may only be confiscated if a crime was committed with "the owner's knowledge or consent" yet in Illinois it does not matter if the owner (and also driver) are completely unaware?? This is totally unfair. It is only a way for the city to collect money because they are broke - and the police are abusing this totally. I understand the police departments receive 65% of the impound money and the individual police officer receives a bonus for going to court. They are obviously out there to serve themselves - not the community. Why would a police officer get a bonus for going to court - the average citizen needs to take days off of work and the city isn't even ready to present their case almost a month later???

But - there was no crime here anyway. Her friend had all charges dropped and paid **NOTHING**. Why were his charges dropped and we were still charged the amount of the impound fee? It doesn't make sense to me. How can the police be allowed to get away with this - it seems criminal.

I sat in the courtroom and heard other stories just like mine - where people were being searched for no reason at all. One police officer testified that the individual was arrested for a drug transaction and his car was impounded. The citizen stated he was waiting for his car to be repaired, was not even in the car, and repeatedly said "if there was a transaction - then where is the money - the police found no money on me or my friends". Like my case, his questions were not answered.

What about the citizens' rights that are listed online - rights for private citizens in Illinois? These rights are listed under Illinois law:


YOUR RIGHTS :


- You have the right to remain silent.
- You have the right to refuse to consent to a search of yourself, your car or your home.
- If you are not under arrest, you have the right to calmly leave.

Chicago police don't abide by these laws? My husband has died and my home is now listed under imminent default and I will very likely lose it. I am working close to 70 hours a week and trying to save every dime - forget xmas this year. It is a tremendous struggle on my own - yet I have to pay the City of Chicago close to \$1200 when they are the ones who broke the law and my daughter and I did nothing wrong???

More than anything else I would like to see Chicago become the great place that it can be so Chicago can become a place where people want to visit, live and work and bring

money, jobs and people to the area. This would obviously benefit all of us and our home values. How can Chicago become the great place we are all working for if the Chicago police are behaving in such an atrocious and disgusting manner - if Chicago police are not following the law - if the Chicago police pull innocent people out of cars for no reason who only stopped to go into a store. Why are they not trying to deal with actual crime rather than targeting people for money. Chicago will never get ahead if those of us who live nearby are afraid to go into the city for fear of dealing with the corrupt police.






11 JAN 2012 13 45


CAROL STREAM IL 601

04 JAN 2012 PM 7 L



Independent Police Review Authority
10 W 35th Street
Chicago, IL 60616

6061663717



ARREST REPORT

3510 S. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60653

(For use by Chicago Police Department Personnel Only)

CPD-11.420C(REV. 6/30)

CB #:

IR #:

YD #:

RD #:

EVENT #:

ARREST REPORTING

OFFENDER	Name:		Beat: 3100	Male	
	Res:			White	
				5' 06"	
				115 lbs	
	Empl:			Hazel Eyes	
				Brown Hair	
				Short Hair Style	
DOB:			Light Complexion		
AGE:					
POB:	Illinois				
ARMED WITH	Unarmed				

INCIDENT	Arrest Date:	16 June 2011 19:38	TRR Completed?	No	Total No Arrested:	1	Co-Arrests		Assoc Cases	
	Location:		Beat:	813	Dependent Children?	No	DCFS Ward ?	No		
	Holding Facility:	Jisc Holding Facility	Youth Division Contacted :		Acevedo, Marco #20137					
	Resisted Arrest?	No			16 June 2011 20:30					

CHARGES	1	Offense As Cited	720 ILCS 550.0/4-B	Victim	
			CANNABIS - POSSESS 2.5-10 GRMS	P.O. Mcgreal #18367, Kathleen	
			Class B - Type M		

RECOVERED NARCOTICS	Type	Approx. Weight/Quantity	Units	Estimated Street Value	IR #
	Suspect Cannabis	3	GRAMS	\$15.00	

WARRANT	NO WARRANT IDENTIFIED	CB #
---------	-----------------------	------

ARREST REPORTING

VICTIM AND COMPLAINANT

Name: P.O. MCGREAL #18367, Kathleen
Empl: 3420 W 63rd St
Chicago, IL 60629

Beat: 823

DOB:

Age:

Comments:

Injured? No

Deceased? No

Hospitalized? No

Treated and Released? No

VICTIM AND COMPLAINANT

Name: P.O. BOYLAN #11901, Bridget
Empl: 3420 W 63rd St
Chicago, IL 60629

Beat: 823

DOB:

Age:

Comments:

Injured? No

Deceased? No

Hospitalized? No

Treated and Released? No

FATHER

JUVENILE RELEASED TO THIS PERSON

Name [REDACTED]
Res [REDACTED]

Beat: 3100

DOB:

Age:

Comments:

Injured? No

Deceased? No

Hospitalized? No

Treated and Released? No

Vehicle: VEHICLE IMPOUNDED: Yes

2000 Automobile - Volvo - S80 - Sedan, 4-Door

VIN#:

Lic# [REDACTED]

IL

Color: Black (Top) / Black (Bottom)

Inv#:

Pound#:

Disposition: Vehicle Impounded

Confiscated Properties :

All confiscated properties are recorded in the e-Track System. This system can be queried by the inventory number to retrieve all official court documents related to evidence and/or recovered properties.

PROPERTIES INFORMATION FOR [REDACTED]

NOT AVAILABLE IN THE AUTOMATED ARREST SYSTEM.

ARREST REPORTING

(The facts for probable cause to arrest AND to substantiate the charges include, but are not limited to, the following)

INCIDENT NARRATIVE

EVENT# [REDACTED] A/O'S WERE ON PATROL IN AREA OF ARREST AND OBSERVED ABOVE OFFENDER, WHO WAS PASSENGER OF VEHICLE, SITTING INSIDE OF VEHICLE WITH SUBJECT CONTACT CARDED UNDER # [REDACTED] (DRIVER) IN THE PARKING LOT OF A 7/11 CONVENIENT STORE. A/O'S NOTICED THAT OFFENDER AND DRIVER HAD BEEN SITTING IN THE LOT AT 7/11 FOR OVER 15 MINUTES. A/O'S APPROACHED VEHICLE TO CHECK THE WELL BEING OF OFFENDER AND DRIVER. A/O'S SMELLED A STRONG ODOR OF CANNABIS COMING FROM VEHICLE SINCE ALL 4 WINDOWS OF VEHICLE WERE COMPLETELY OPEN. A/O'S THEN OBSERVED A SMALL SILVER CANISTER IN THE PASSENGER SIDE DOOR OF VEHICLE WHICH HAD GREEN RESIDUE ON THE SIDES. A/O'S IMMEDIATELY RECOVERED SAID OBJECT WHICH HAD A STRONG ODOR OF CANNABIS AND OFFENDER OPENLY STATED THAT IT WAS HIS PROPERTY AND THAT HE FORGOT THAT THERE WAS ANY CANNABIS INSIDE OF SAID SILVER CANISTER. A/O'S THEN PLACED OFFENDER INTO CUSTODY AND TRANSPORTED OFFENDER TO 008. FATHER OF OFFENDER [REDACTED] @ 2015HRS AND TOLD FATHER TO PICK UP OFFENDER AT JISC. VEHICLE WAS IMPOUNDED. SUSPECT CANNABIS WAS INVENTORIED IN THE 008TH DISTRICT UNDER # [REDACTED] ORANGE STICKER AFFIXED TO VEHICLE.

COURT KEY-M
NO WARRANTS/INVEST ALERTS/NOT ON GANG PROBATION
NO GANG AFFIL

Desired Court Date:

Branch:

Court Sgt Handle? No

Initial Court Date:

Branch: - Room

Docket #:

BOND INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE

ATTESTING OFFICER:

REPORTING PERSONNEL

I hereby declare and affirm, under penalty of perjury, that the facts stated herein are accurate to the best of my knowledge, information and/or belief.

Attesting Officer: #18367 MCGREAL, K M [REDACTED] 16 JUN 2011 20:47

ARRESTING OFFICER(S):

			Beat
1st Arresting Officer:	#18367	MCGREAL, K M [REDACTED]	0821
2nd Arresting Officer:	#11901	BOYLAN, B A [REDACTED]	0821

APPROVING SUPERVISOR:

Approval of Probable Cause : #107 WALSH, D P [REDACTED] 16 JUN 2011 21:31

ARREST PROCESSING REPORT

Holding Facility: Jisc Holding Facility
Received in Lockup: 16 June 2011 22:27
Prints Taken: 16 June 2011 22:36
Palprints Taken: Yes
Photograph Taken: 16 June 2011 22:32
Released from Lockup: 16 June 2011 23:14

Time Last Fed:
Time Called: Phone#:
Cell #: 0-0 -
Placed under close observation
Transport Details : 2PO 0821 16-JUN-2011 19:46

VISUAL CHECK OF ARRESTEE

ARRESTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

Is there obvious pain or injury? No
Is there obvious signs of infection? No
Under the influence of alcohol/drugs? No
Signs of alcohol/drug withdrawal? No
Appears to be despondent? No
Appears to be irrational? No
Carrying medication? No

Presently taking medication? No
(if female)are you pregnant? No
First time ever been arrested? No
Attempted suicide/serious harm? No
Serious medical or mental problems? No
Are you receiving treatment? No

T O T Y

RETURN TO HOLDING FACILITY COMMENTS:

QUESTIONNAIRE REMARKS:

LOCKUP KEEPER COMMENTS:

EMERGENCY CONTACT

Name : REFUSED

Res:

Beat:

INTERVIEW LOG

NO INTERVIEWS LOGGED

VISITOR LOG

NO VISITORS LOGGED

ARREST PROCESSING REPORT

MOVEMENT LOG

MOVEMENT LOG INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE

WC COMMENTS

Watch Commander Comments:

REL w/o CHARGING

DOES NOT APPLY TO THIS ARREST

PROCESSING PERSONNEL

ARRESTEE PROCESSING PERSONNEL:

Beat

Searched By: RILEY, D L [REDACTED]
Lockup Keeper: #4066 NELSON, G A [REDACTED]
Detective/Investigator: #20148 METKE, N M [REDACTED]
Fingerprinted By: RILEY, D L [REDACTED]
Investigator Notified: #20137 ACEVEDO, M A [REDACTED]

5645

APPROVAL PERSONNEL:

Beat

Final Approval of Charges : #107 WALSH, D P [REDACTED] 17 JUN 2011 01:20